

S.R.30

UDOT Project # S-R199(185)

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3 Results

Meeting Date: March 13, 2017
Meeting Location: Logan Environmental Center, 153 N 1400 W
Meeting Time: 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 pm

Purpose of the meeting:

- To update the group on the status of the study
- To present the results of level 2 screening results and gather input
- To present and discuss updated information on possible bicycle facilities
- To present updated roadway cross sections and alignments and gather input
- To discuss next steps in the EIS evaluation process

**See meeting PPT slides for additional details to support results*

I. Attendance

- Stakeholder Working Group members
 - Mark Nielsen, Logan City
 - Josh Runhaar, Cache Co.
 - Jeff Gilbert, CMPO
 - Todd Meyers, Maverik Store / Corporate
 - Richard Mueller, Bridgerland Audubon Society
 - Eve Davies, Pacificorp
 - Jeff Kunzler, Ag / Cow Pasture Irrigation
 - Paul Barnard, LW Miller
 - Chris Ransom, UDOT Maintenance
- UDOT
 - Rod Terry, UDOT / Project Mgr.
 - Vic Saunders, UDOT R1 Communications Mgr.
 - Naomi Kisen, UDOT / Environmental
- HDR - Vince Izzo, Consultant Project Manager
- Bio-West
 - Andrea Moser – amoser@bio-west.com / 435-232-2237
 - Bob Thomas – bthomas@bio-west.com / 435-890-9311
- KMP - Mike Pepper, Public Involvement Lead

II. Study Status Update

- Activities since SWG meeting #2 – Mike gave a brief overview of the activities completed since the last SWG meeting and upcoming activities in the EIS process

- SWG meeting #2 results – The Group had no additional changes to the meeting results. The Group indicated the results content and level of detail met their needs.

III. Level 2 Screening Results

- Alternatives screened – Mike reviewed the list of alternatives that were screened in Level 1 and those that advanced and have now been screened in Level 2; Alternative 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E and 8.
- Level 2 screening criteria – Mike / Vince overviewed the Level 2 screening criteria, which primarily address built and natural environmental impacts and cost.
- Level 2 screening results – Mike / Vince described the Level 2 screening results and the team’s preliminary recommendation to advance only Alternative 6E for further evaluation in the EIS. It was explained that 6E meets the study Purpose and Need and was identified as the best balance between environmental regulatory considerations and roadway performance. It was reinforced that this is a preliminary recommendation only at this time. A 30-day comment period will be provided before UDOT decides on the advancement of alternatives.
- The team highlighted the reasons for their recommendation to advance only Alternative 6E as the Preliminary Alternative as follows: (also included in the PPT)
 - *All Alt 6 options impact less wetlands, prime farmland, open water, sensitive habitat and floodplain than Alt 5*
 - *All Alt 6 options are lower cost than Alt 5 and Alt 8*
 - *Alt 8 has less environmental impacts, but is prone to icing, is less safe and is significantly more expensive*
 - *Alt 6E, when compared to other Alt 6 options, has;*
 - *the least regulatory impacts*
 - *the best transportation performance*
 - *more travel lanes near SR 23*
 - *more consistent lane configuration throughout*
- Additional study team comments regarding the Level 2 screening results and preliminary recommendation to advance only Alternative 6E
 - USACE regulations require that projects avoid wetland impacts if possible and 6E impacts approximately 2 acres less wetlands than Alt 5
 - Alt 6E meets the approved study Purpose and Need
- SWG comments regarding the Level 2 screening results
 - A single lane (as included in Alt 6E) may not be enough to handle traffic congestion at 3200 West
 - Question: What is the amount of wetland impacts to implement only the safety improvements of 6E or Alt 5? - 12-ft. shoulders, plus the 14-ft. median and intersection turn lanes. Answer: It would be the same as provided in the screening analysis.
 - Question: Why are Alt 6E and 6C the same cost when 6C has less pavement? Answer: The numbers are rounded in the evaluation and the amount of additional pavement is small.
 - Concerned about unsafe conditions created when lanes are added or dropped
 - Question: How much additional cost to build Alt 5 in 2050; Why not build now and be done?

- Question: Are there safety issues where the passing lane transitions back to a two-lane section. Answer: The transition area will meet UDOT standards; however, there could be a slight increase in the risk for accidents.
- The additional \$5 million cost (of Alt 5 over Alt 6E) seems worth it considering the better outcome of a 5-lane roadway over the mixed lane configuration in 6E
- Question: Why was Alt 8 developed, considering its high cost? Less canal impacts?
- Consider possible canal piping in conjunction with this project. The canal piping would be a local project. Retain some livestock access.
- Consider a railing to prevent cars from running into the canal
- Right of way impact differences on Pacificorp property
 - Widening primarily to the south will have more impact on the Pacificorp recreation sites
 - Consider the “process cost” to take right of way out of the PacificCorp property, since FERC is involved
- Many Group members expressed more support for Alternative 5, than Alternative 6E. Specific comments from the Group were as follows;
 - The small amount (2 acres) of additional wetlands that would be impacted and relatively small cost difference (\$5 million more for the 5-lane alternative) do not justify recommending the mixed lane alternative (6E) over Alternative 5
 - Do it right (Alt 5) now
 - May cost more later (to implement Alt 5)
 - Wetland savings is not worth the cost trade-off to not have five lanes throughout
 - Why not ask the USACE to advance Alt 5 too, as the preference?
 - Wetlands throughout the corridor will be impacted from construction of Alt 6E anyway

IV. Bicycle Use Alternatives

- Mike / Vince explained the two possible alternatives for bicycle facilities;
 - Separated paved two-way bicycle path – not funded as part of the roadway project
 - **When constrained; wetlands, structures, etc.**
 - May be constructed within the 30-ft. clear zone on the south side of SR 30
 - **When not constrained;**
 - May be constructed outside the 30-ft. clear zone
 - Contingent on partner participation for right of way
 - **Funding and Maintenance**
 - UDOT will work with local entities to obtain construction funding
 - Local entities will be responsible for facility maintenance
 - Shoulder pathway - If a separated bicycle facility is not developed, bicycle use could occur in the new 12-ft. paved roadway shoulder
- Study team comments regarding possible bicycle facilities
 - It was noted that the cost for a separated bicycle facility is not part of this project
- SWG comments regarding possible bicycle facilities
 - Suggest that UDOT funding for bicycle facilities as part of this project be given the same consideration as in other UDOT projects

- What about the possibility of a corridor / facility to support movement of agricultural equipment through the SR 30 corridor? A five-lane configuration (Alt 5) supports this need better than Alt 6E
- Suggest additional sweeping of the 12-ft. shoulder to facilitate safer bicycle use
- Suggest acquiring and environmentally clearing the right of way needed for a separated bicycle facility now, as part of this project
- At this point, there are almost no bicycle riders using the SR 30 corridor, assumed due to lack of a safe, separated facility
 - Question: What is the USACE's opinion about the right of way / wetland impacts of adding a separated bicycle facility inside or outside of the clear zone?
- Many the SWG members support the development of a separated path; a minority do not
 - Some lack of support for a separated bicycle facility was expressed from farmer SWG members due to the additional cost, right of way needs and maintenance requirements

V. Updated Preliminary Roadway Concept Designs and Alignment

- Roadway cross sections
 - Mike gave an overview of the updated preliminary roadway concept designs for;
 - Rural roadway; two-lane, three-lane and four-lane sections between 1900 W and SR 23
 - Urban five-lane section between 1900 W and 1000 W
 - Group comments regarding cross sections
 - Logan City standard park strip is 8-ft. wide, as compared to the proposed 5-ft. width, although Logan City would accept the 5-ft. width. Note that the 5-ft. width is the minimum width to allow trees in the park strip
 - Question: What about including a 10-ft. 2-way sidewalk in the urban section? Answer – this would require additional right of way and construction cost, so this is not proposed at this time
 - Consider fencing in the rural sections at the outside edge of the right of way to prevent wildlife from entering roadway, especially from 3200 W to the Gun Club
 - Suggest UDOT review the animal crash data to assist with identification of animal crossing areas
 - A center median barrier may impede the occasional moving of livestock through the corridor from one pasture to another, especially near 3200 W
 - Answer: There will be periodic openings at left turn areas at key livestock movement locations including 4000 West and 3200 West. There will also be other openings for smaller accesses along the corridor.
 - Action: Suggest asking for input on this issue in the upcoming newsletter
 - The proposed clear zone may provide needed space for livestock movement

- Questioned the type of vegetation that would be planted in the median and clear zone. UDOT noted it would be native vegetation and would not require irrigation
- SR 30 / 1000 W intersection
 - Mike explained the current proposed preliminary concept design for the SR 30 / 1000 W intersection includes a single left turn on SR 30 EB / NB onto 1000 W
 - Mike also noted that the team met today at 11 a.m. with the adjacent intersection property owners (LW Miller, Maverik and Fur Breeders) to discuss preliminary intersection design and related issues
- SR 23 / SR 30 intersection
 - Mike explained that no changes to the possible SR 23/SR 30 intersection have occurred since the last SWG meeting
- Roadway alignment
 - Mike explained that no changes to the possible new roadway alignment have occurred since the last SWG meeting

VI. Final Discussion, Actions and Next Steps

- Other issues
 - Fencing replacement – it was suggested by two Group members (following the meeting) that to reduce UDOT liability, any fencing of livestock areas (that would be added or replaced as part of a future SR 30 project) be conveyed to the property owner, so that the property owner assumed liability for the fencing maintenance and any future livestock escape from the property, etc.
- Other actions
 - Action: The team will communicate with the SWG following the 30-day comment period to inform them of UDOT's decision regarding alternative advancement and next steps
- Next SWG meeting – Fall 2017 – date to be announced – Present the draft EIS
- Final discussion and adjourn at 3:45 p.m.